G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1896-1897
~~19~~ .
(Miscellaneous)

File No. 33 Section I

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

File relating to the recovery of rent due on the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Kasi Visweswara Swamy Temple at Ganjam, Srikurmapatnam Taluk from one Venkatalingam Gosai

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

1901-1902

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 14th March 1902

No. 1426-34
Muz F. 53-96

Passing orders in the matter of defending at Government cost a suit brought by one Venkatagiri Gosavi against Bettegauda, a tenant of the Inam lands attached to the Sri Kasi Visveswaraswami temple at Ganjam, Seringapatam Taluk

SBP—20-3-02—200

READ—

Government Proceedings No. 920-1—Muz. F. 33-96, dated 8th February 1897, directing the assumption by Government in the Muzrai Department, of the entire management of the temple of the Sri Kasi Visveswaraswami and of its endowments in the Seringapatam Taluk.

AND,

Correspondence ending with letter No. 211, dated 3rd January 1902, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, requesting sanction to defend at the expense of Government, the suit brought by one Venkatagiri Gosayi, against Betteganda, one of the tenants of the Inam lands belonging to the institution, and stating that it has been posted for hearing on the 20th instant.

No. 1426-34—Muz. F. 33-96, dated Bangalore, 14th March 1902.

ORDER THEREON.—The temple of Sri Kasi Visveswara at Ganjam is a Muzrai Institution endowed with the marginally noted Inam lands in Kirangur village, Seringapatam Taluk. The affairs of the institution were being managed by a line of Gosayi ascetics, the last of whom was one Dhanaraja Bharati. He died in 1895, appointing while alive, one Venkatagiri Gosayi as his agent for the management of the temple lands.

Survey No.	Extent A. G.	Assessment. Rs
417	2 5	16
418	1 15	10
421	2 15	18
429	2 13	19
430	1 31	14
431	1 37	16
432	2 31	22
433	1 24	12
434	2 13	18
435	1 31	14
436	1 17	11
437	2 20	19
425	0 22	4

2. The Deputy Commissioner having reported to Government that the affairs of the temple were in the most unsatisfactory state and that the building had fallen into disrepair, the Government in their Proceedings No. 920-1, dated 8th February 1897 read above, directed the assumption of the management of the temple and its Inam lands, and the Deputy Commissioner was requested to take charge of the lands forthwith and to place them under the management of the Taluk Amildar.

3. On receipt of the Government Order, the Amildar of the Seringapatam Taluk assumed the management of the temple and its endowments in April 1897 and obtained a mutchalika from Venkatagiri Gosayi binding him to produce the produce of the Inam lands for 1896-97. What action was taken to recover the produce of that year (1896-97) is not understood.

4. Separate mutchalikas were similarly obtained from Bettegauda and Hanumegauda, the two raiyats who were then cultivating the temple lands, binding them to pay to the Amildar on behalf of the temple, an annual gutta of 130 kandis of paddy, 130 seers of other grains, and 130 bundles of straw with effect from the year Hevilambi (1897-98). But it is observed that after the execution of the mutchalikas, the Amildar left the produce of the Inam lands with Bettegauda (one of the tenants) who unauthorizedly sold away a portion of the produce to his own advantage and when questioned on the point he deposed before the Amildar that he would pay the value of 260 kandis of paddy thus sold at Rs. 5 per kandi, within a month's time and that in default, his property might be proceeded against. Whether the rate agreed to by the raiyat, *viz.*, at Rs. 5 per kandi was reasonable and why immediate steps were not taken by the Amildar or the Deputy Amildar to recover the value of the produce in accordance with the terms of the mutchalikas, have not been explained by the Deputy Commissioner.

5. The negligence on the part of the Amildar or the Deputy Amildar in having left the produce of the lands for the years Hevilambi, Vilambi and Vikari, in the possession of the tenants gave room to the creditors of Venkatagiri Gosayi to have the produce attached in satisfaction of a decree obtained by them against Venkatagiri Gosayi. But, however, the raiyat Bettegauda cannot on this account shirk his responsibility to make good the amount to Government in accordance with his own mutchalikas.

Muzrai, dated 14th March 1902

6. The Deputy Commissioner in his letter read above states that Venkatagiri Gosavi has now filed a suit in the Mysore Sub-Judge's Court against Bettegauda for the recovery of certain produce of the Inam lands attached to the temple and that on the written statement of the latter, the Sub-Judge has made him (the Deputy Commissioner) a party to the suit; and he therefore solicits sanction to defend the *suit at Government cost. He further states that Bettegauda has been assured that* Government would oppose the plaintiff Venkatagiri Gosayi's claim and see that he (Bettegauda) is not made to pay rents twice over.

7. Government regret that although the temple and its lands were taken over by Government so far back as 1897, not even a single year's rent has been collected by the Revenue authorities The negligent officers, of whom there seem to be more than one, should be made personally liable for the lax manner in which they have proceeded in this matter. Explanations of the officers concerned should be obtained and submitted for orders of Government. They have neither recovered the possession of the land, nor collected the produce or its value for three years. If the Deputy Commissioner gave the assurance to Bettegauda that he will be supported Bettegauda does not seem to have given over any advantage to Government or rather to the Deputy Commissioner for which he can claim to be re-imbursed in the shape of this promised support. He sold away the produce and has not paid a single pie. There seems to be no reason why under these circumstances the Government should volunteer to defend this suit. The Sub-Judge's order to make the Deputy Commissioner a party seems to have been based upon an expressed intention of the Deputy Commissioner to be so dealt with. On the whole, the Government are not prepared to authorize the defence of this suit at Government cost. The local officers whose names should be reported will be held responsible for all the money due on this account which they must collect from the lessees, whose leases they accepted. They must now evict the lessees from the possession of the land and take the land into the possession of Government and deal with it in due course.

8. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to report immediately the action taken by him on all the points noted above.

Dy. Secy. to Govt., Muzrai Dept.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts, for information.
The Palace Controller, Mysore, for information.

Exd—J.T.R.

Remember

MUZRAI

1901–02

From The Secretary to the Government of Mysore. Muzrai Dept.

To The Dy Com^r Mysore Dist.

Dated 11
Despatched June '02.
Received
General No. 2049
Muzrai F. No. 33-96
Enclosure No.

Govt Pro: No 1426-34 Mur 733-96 Dated 14th March 1902 re declining to authorize the defence, at Govt Cost, of a suit brought by one Venkatagiri Gosayi against Bettegouda, a tenant of the Inam lands attached to the Sri Kasi Visweswaraswami temple, a Muzrai Institution at Ganjam, Srirangapatana Taluk, and requesting the Deputy Commissioner to report on the various points raised in the Pro: quoted above.

MGCPB—11-1-1901—1500

Has the honor to draw
the Deputy Commissioners
attention to the above
and to request that the
report therein called
for may be submitted
without further delay.

By order

11/6/07

Dy Secretary
Interior Dept

RS

1901-902.



From H. Ramanujiengar Esqre
~~The~~ Deputy Commissioner of
the Mysore District

To L. Anantaswamy Rao Esquire BA
~~The~~ Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
~~General and Revenue~~
Muzrai Department

Dated 14th June 1902
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No 1 memo

General No. 360

Submitting a report in the matter of the recovery of rents due to Sri Kasi Visveswara Swami temple at Ganjam, Seringapatam Taluk.

No 360 OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER.

Enclosures No. / memo MYSORE DISTRICT.

Dated Mysore 14th June 1902.

From, H. Ramanujiyar Esquire
d/tg Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

To L. Anantaswami Rao Esquire BA
Deputy ~~The~~ Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Mamlat ~~General~~ ~~and~~ ~~Revenue~~ Departments.

Sir,

Referring to Government Proceedings No 1426—34 Mamlat 33-96 dated 14th March 1902 and reminder No 2049/33-96 dated 1st June 1902, I have the honor to forward herewith a memo submitted by Dbr. Assistant Commissioner C.B. Seshagiri Rao in the matter of the rents due to Sri Kasi Visveswara Swami temple at Ganjam.

It will be observed ~~that~~:—

(1) towards the rents for the year 1896—97 certain lands of a surely have been sold but pending the orders of Government the sale has not yet been confirmed;

(2) that in respect of the rents for 1897—98 and 1898—99 a suit is pending in the Sub Court and

3) that the rents for the years 1899—00 and 1900—01 have been almost fully recovered.

The rents for 1897—98 and 1898—99 could not be recovered owing to attachment by means of prohibitory orders issued by the Sub Judge, Mysore when a claim was preferred for the removal of the attachment, the Sub Judge rejected the claim Thereupon, Rao Bahadoor Dbr. Madiah sought—

orders of Government to have the attachment set aside by means of a regular suit, but no orders have as yet been passed.

Independent of the attachment by the Civil Court, steps were taken to realize the rents for 1897-98 and 1898-99 by attachment and sale of the lessee's immovable property, and a sum of Rs 430 is reported to be the sale proceeds. As this sale took place only on the 10th May 1902 it has not yet been confirmed.

It is possible that the lessee Bette Gowda may pay up the full amount due by him for the said two years as I had him up before me and spoke to him on the subject.

In these circumstances I beg the Government will be pleased to reconsider their decision in the matter of defending the suit now pending in the Sub Court at the cost of the temple funds

I may add that the lands have been since taken possession of and leased to one Timke Gowda who has paid up the rents for the year Plava (1901-02) amounting to Rs 788-2-0.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Sri Kasi Visweswara temple in Seringapatam

The rents for 1896-97 were ordered by Mr. Panchanatha Rao to be delivered over to Venkatagiri Gosaye on his Executing a Muchalikè - with a surety - to produce the rents or their value when called upon to do so. This was on the 19th January 1897. On receipt of the Government Order directing that the ma. - nagement of the temple and the Inam Lands be taken over by the Amildar, Venkatagiri Gosayé was called upon to produce the rents, but he failed to do so. As he had no property of his own, his surety Jogéndragiri was proceeded against, and a land belonging to him

urging that Government had assumed the management of the lands, that he had executed a rental deed in favour of the landlord, and that the rents were, therefore, not liable to be attached. The Subordinate Judge disallowed the claim.

In the letter quoted above Mr. Mudiah sought orders to take steps to have the attachment set aside by a regular suit. No orders have been passed.

A sum of Rs. 475-15-6 has been recovered by way of rents for Vikari 1899-00, and Survari 1900-01, and the balance is being collected by attachment and sale of the tenants' property.

The rents for 1897-98 and 1898-99 already referred to as having been attached have been since sold by

Rs. 1105-15-3 has been collected up to date

1141 1141

Mysore Dept-

Read :—

Government Letter no

1426-34 dated 14th March 1902,
Mysg Sr 33-96

declining to authorize the defence
of the suit against
Bette Gowda, one of the
tenants of the temple Inam
lands, ~~of Government cost~~
of the Sri Kasi Visweswara
Swami Temple in the
Srirangapatnam Taluk

And Letter no 360/435
dated 14th June 1902, from
the Dy Commr, Mysore
District, requesting to re-
-consider the Govt order
read above.

No 699 Dy 9-10-02.
Mysr. 33-96

Order

The Government

See no sufficient grounds to reconsider their order already passed.

2. As regards the question raised in the Dy Comm's (Mr Mordicks) letter No 95 dated 19th January 10 seeking the orders of Govt to keep up the attached property of Jogendrajee Gosaji in satisfaction of the produce of the Inam lands due to the temple for 1896-97, the Dy Comm is requested to report how the matter stands now

3. In regard to the produce of 1897-98 and 98-99 the Dy Comm states that the lessees' immovable property was attached and sold for

for Rs 430 but that the sale has not yet been confirmed. It should now be reported whether the sale was since confirmed and whether the full amount of the two years produce in question was recovered from the lessee.

The Dy Comr's action in having taken possession of the lands from the lessee and leased them to one Sirsike Gowda for Rs 788-2- for the year Plavay (1901-02) is approved.

[Please see note below]

4. 5. From Mr. Lushington Rice's memo forming the enclosure to the Dy Comr's letter under reply, it is observed that a sum

Of Rs 1105-15-3 was collected
up to 14th June 1902 ~~and~~ for 1899-900 and 1900-901 &
that the balance was being
collected by attachment
and sale of the tenant's
property. It should be
reported whether the arrears
~~were~~ have since been remitted
¶6. The submission of
the Explanations of the
Officers concerned referred
to in para 7 of the first
order passed above, should
be expedited.

(Dewan's order) 8/10/02
Dy Secretary
Finance Dept

To The Dy Commr.
Nellore Dt.



1903 – 1904

From B. K. Venkatnaranappa Iyengar Esq
Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

To L. Anantasami Rao Esq
Deputy Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
in the Muzrai Department

Dated 24th November 1903

Despatched

Received

General No. 117

No.

Enclosure No. 1.

Soliciting order, in the matter of remitting to the Subjudge's Court at Mysore, the amount realized by the sale of paddy belonging to the Sri Kasi Visweswara Swamy temple at Ganjam, Seringapatam Taluk.

Deputy Commissioner's office
Mysore District.
Inam Department
Dated Mysore 24th November 1903

From S. T. Venkatavarada Iyengar Esq
Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

To L. Anantasami Rao, Esq B.A.
Deputy Secretary to the Govern
ment of Mysore, in the Inam
Department

Sir

In submitting herewith a memo of
the facts in re the produce of Inam lands
belonging to the Sri Kasi Viswesvara Swami
temple at Ganjam in the Seringapatam Taluk
I have the honor to request the favor of
early orders in the matter of remitting to
the Mysore Subordinate Judge's Court, the
amount realized by the sale of paddy belong
ing to the said temple and kept in the Savings
Bank at the credit of the temple.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
[signature]

Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

Memo.

As seen in Govt. Order

No. 1426-34 dated 14th March
Inam: 733-96
1902 the temple of Sri Kasi
Viswesvara swami at Ganja
in the Seringapatam Taluk is
a Muzrai Institution endowed
with Inam lands (Survey Nos
417, 418, 421, 430 to 437 and 425)
in Kirangur village, Seringapa-
tam Taluk. The affairs of
the temple were being managed
by a line of Gosayi ascetics,
the last of whom was one
Dhanaraj Bharati. He died
in 1895 appointing, while
alive, one Venkatagiri Gosayi
as his agent for the manage-

of the temple and its lands.

2. The Dy Commr. having re-ported that the affairs of the temple were in a ~~parade~~ most unsatisfactory state, the Govt. in their Rev: No. 920-1 dated 8th February 1897 directed assumption of the management of the temple and its lands and the Dy Commr requested to take charge of the lands forthwith and to place them under the management of the Taluk Amildar.

3. The Amildar did assume management of the temple and its lands in April 1897. He obtained a Muchulika from Venkatpri Gosavi binding him to produce the produce of the Inam lands for 1896 to 97. [illegible] Muchulika, dated [illegible] Decr 1896 et seq were -

Similarly obtained from Bettegowda and Hanume gowda, the 2 ryots who were then cultivating the temple lands, binding them to pay to the Amildar the annual putta of the lands.

4. After the receipt of Govt. order Mr. Panchana Rao the then Sub Dy. Coll. ordered the produce of 1896-97 to be handed over to Venkat-giri Gosayi on his executing a Mutchalike as aboresaid and furnishing security to produce the same or value whenever required to do so. But Venkatgiri Gosayi failed to act up to the terms of his Mutchalike and the property of his surety even when sold fetched only Rs. 181

Mutchalikas were obtained from the ryots for subsequent years the Amildar left the produce with Bettegowda who unauthorizedly sold away a part of the produce for his own use and when questioned deposed before the Amildar that he would pay the value of the paddy.

5. Venkatajji Gosavi had filed a suit against Dhanaraj Bharati in O.S. No. 61 of 1892, Sub Court, and obtained a decree for Rs. 4349 and odd with interest and costs against the said Dhanaraj Bharati and the lands. In the course of the suit Vaikatajji Gosavi has deposed that he was the Defendant's agent and was as such managing the temple and its lands and that in the course of his agency he was obliged to pay moneys

out of his own pocket for the maintenance of the temple Venkatgirisoorya also obtained another decree in the said Court in O.S. No. 15 of 1892 against the said Dhanaraj Bhanabi and he attached the lands before Judgment.

One Govindaramanna who held a decree against Venkatagiri Gosayi attached the 2 decrees above said obtained against Dhanaraj Bhanabi by Venkatgiri Gosayi and in Ex. No. 325/326 of 1900-1901 Sub Court attached the crops of the lands for the years Hevilambi, Vilam-bi and Vikari - 390 Kandus of paddy - in the possession of Bettegowda and asked for their sale, and the Court issued notice dated 14th December 1899 Ex: No. 366 of 1899-1900 (and

and 11th January 1901 to
Bettegowda to produce the
paddy before the court – (The
Court observed in Govt. Order No
1426 aforesaid that "the
negligence on the part of the Amildar
or the Dy. Amildar in having left
the produce for 3 years, Heralambi
Vilumbi & Vikari in the possession
of the ryots gave room to the
creditors of Venkatajirao raje
to have the produce attached).

6. However Bettegowda did
not produce the produce before
the court as directed, and so
the right to receive the produce
seems to have been sold
by the Sub Court and bought
in by Venkatajirao raje, who
has, appears from his plaint
in O.S. No 18 of 1901 1902 Sub Ct,
against Bettegowda, sought
to recover the paddy or its
value from Bettegowda
& c. Bettegowda in his

turn wanted to implead the Dy Commr: who was however not made a party.

Then Venkatpiri Gosanji himself for the standing crops on the lands attached by the Sub Court in Ex: No 362 of 1901-1902 Tirukeppoda, the then Govt: ryot, was given by the Court a prohibitory notice not to deliver the standing crops to anybody until further orders of the Court. This was on 5th December 1901. The Dy Commr: then preferred a claim - viz no 529 of 1901-1902 (which was tried by the District Judge) stating that the property belonged to the Muzrai Institution and should be released from the attachment: the Advocate for Venkatpiri Gosanji stated in reply that his claim -

&c.

decree was a mortgage decree
making the attached properties
liable under it and the claim
was therefore not maintainable
under section 278 of the Civil Pro:
Code. The claimant's advocate
admitted this proposition of law
and the claim was therefore rejected.
Venkatgiri pragji then put in
Ex. No 288 of 1902-1903 Sub Court,
requesting the Dy Commr
to send to the Sub Court the
Sale proceeds of the paddy
crops then in the hands of
the Dy Amildar of T. Rode. It
was by that time discovered
that Venkatgiri pragji's decree
made the lands only liable
under it but not the crops.
So the Dy Commr again
objected to the attachment
of crops and also asked the
District Judge to review his
order in this: No 529 of 1901-1902
the cross passed under

a wrong representation of facts. The District Judge thought however it to be unnecessary to go into the question. Meanwhile Venkatasiri Iyengar preferred Ex. No. 654 of 1902-1903 reiterating his prayer to receive for the sale proceeds of the paddy. The then Dy. Commr sent a reply to the Court stating that the Dy. Amildar had been written to, but that no reply had been received. Venkatasiri Iyengar then put in Ex. No. 103 of 1903-1904 making the same prayer and the case is posted to the 24th Instant to hear from the Dy. Commr.

8. So that the present call on the Dy. Commr. is simply a continuation of the former

Contd

Commenced in Ex. No. 362
of 1901-1902 wherein the Plff
is Venkatji Pandit and the
defendant is Dhanaraj Bhanabi
(dead by his uncle Narasimha
Bhanabi). Neither Govt nor
Tirukkoyda was a party either
to the original suits or to the
Execution proceedings, which
therefore cannot bind them.
The attachment therefore is
totally inoperative as against
the Govt. The decree holder
will have simply to sell
the right to receive the crop
and the purchaser in Court
sale will have then to file
a suit against Tirukkoyda
or Govt if he has any such
right. If this view is correct
the Govt may refuse to send
the money as requested by the

K. Narayanaswami
Hd Munshi

Ky
H. Smith

Dy Commr's Office
Bellary

MYSORE
MU

385

01/11/03

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

19 —19

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, L.C.E., B.A.,
DEPUTY SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Dy Commr
Mysore Dt

Dated 30 Nov 1903.

Despatched

Received

General No. 1536

Muzrai F. No. 33-96

Enclosure No.

It has been brought to notice that the inam lands endowed to the temple of Sri Kasi Visweswarar at Gunjam in the Sreerangapatam Taluk have this Year remained uncultivated. In invitation the Dy Commr's reference to Govt Pro. No 4226-34 Muzr 7 33-96 dy 14th March 1902,

MGCPB—1,000—21-7-03.

I am the honor to state that the lands which are under the management of Govt. had been hitherto yielding an annual Gutter of 180 Khandies of paddy. If it is a fact that the lands in question have this year remained uncultivated, the Dy Comm^r is requested to explain who should be held personally responsible for not having given over the lands for cultivation. A detailed report is requested.

By order

Dy Sec^y
Revy Deptt

Dy Sec^y
27/5

for this neglect of duty.

An early reply is requested.

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

19 —19

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
DEPUTY SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Dy Commr
Mysore District

Dated

Despatched 10th December 1903

Received

General No. 1681
Muzrai F. No. 33-96.

Enclosure No. Nil

His letter no 119
dated 24th November 1903
which was received in this
Office on the 27th idem)
soliciting orders in the
matter of remitting to
the Sub-Judge's Court-
at Mysore the amount
realized by the Sale of
Jewels belonging to the
Sri Krishnaswamy
Swamis Temple at

MGCPB—1,000—21-7-03.

Tiruvengadapuram Taluk

With reference to the above
has the honour to invite
the Dy Comr's attention
to the marginally-noted
communications from this office regarding
the affairs of this temple
and to state that unless
a detailed report on all
the points therein noticed,
is submitted, the Govt
are not in a position to
pass final orders on
the ~~subject~~ present communi-
-cation -

(1) Govt Lr no 1426-34 dated 14 March 1902
proc ft 33-96

(1) Govt Lr no 699 dated 9 Oct '02.
proc ft 33-96

(1) Board-no 15536 dated 30 Nov 1903
proc ft 33-96

5/12/03



1903 · 1904

From B. K. Venkataramaniengar
Sept
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To L. C. Arunachalam Rao Sahib
B.A.
Deputy Secretary to
the Govt of Mysore
in the Muzrai Dept

Dated 1st January 1904.

Despatched

Received

General No. 1:4
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file.

Referring to the
non cultivation of the Inam
Lands enclosed to the Collector
of this District Vide correspondence
ending with your D.O. letter

Refers
Ds
5/1/04

W/154

Deputy Commissioner's
Mysore district.
Muzrai. Department
Dated 31st December 1903

To

L. Anantasami Rao Esqr, B.A.
Deputy Secretary to the Government
of Mysore in the Muzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 1536 dated the 30th November 1903 calling for certain information regarding the nomenclature of the Inam lands endowed to the temple of Sri Kasi Visweswara swami at Ganjam in the Seringapatam Taluk, I have the honor to transmit herewith the correspondence ending with the French Rocks Sub Division Officer's Yadi No. 327 dated the 13th September 903. On the 20th February 1903, Mr. Sheik Abdulla Deputy Amildar of the French Rocks Sub Taluk stated in his report to the Sub Division Officer that he would lease out the lands for the current year. On the 7th March 1903 the Sub Division Officer told him to do so at once as it was already getting late. On the 16th March 1903,

the

the Deputy Amildar reported to the Sub Division Officer that the ryots who cultivated the land last year had suffered great loss on account of the decree obtained by one Venkatagiri Ryot against them and that they asked that the lands might be leased out to them for 110 Kandies of paddy. This correspondence was received in this office on the 31st March 1903. On the 4th April 1903, one Batche Rao applied to this office to lease out the lands to him for 3 years at 112 Kandies of paddy per year. This was referred to the Deputy Amildar for report. On 18th May 1903, i.e after a lapse of 1 month and a half the then Deputy Amildar Mr. Dorasami Pillay reported that he had auctioned the right of cultivating the lands that the said Batche Rao was the highest bidder, and that he leased the lands to him for 3 years at

112 Kandies of paddy per year. On the 12th June 1903 my predecessor Mr. M. Kantaraj Urs confirmed the lease for one year on the score that it would be a great loss to the temple to lease them for 3 years. The bidder Balche Ras declined to take up the land for 1 year only. Whereupon the Deputy Amildar was directed to recall the right of cultivating them. The correspondence was received back in his office on the 20th August 1903, when orders were issued to the Sub Division officer to get the lands cultivated this year. But the Deputy Amildar, in his No. 52 dated the 8th September 1903, reports that the ryots are very much afraid of the said lease holder Venkatagiri Gosayi who constantly troubles them with attachment of their personal properties &c, and that therefore nobody comes forward to take up the lands for cultivation this year.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
[signature]
Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

Read :-

Letter no 154 dated January 1904, from the Dy Commissioner, Tanjore District, explaining the circumstances under which the lands belonging to the Sri Kasi Viswesvara Swamie temple at Ganjam in the Srivaikuntam Taluk, remained unattested for the 1902-3 fasli

No. 2189 Dy 29.1.04 Encl 1 Ctr
Mad. F. 33-96

Order :-

Recorded with the observation that the explanation submitted by the local officers is not satisfactory - It was the duty of the Dy Assistant of French-Rocks

in whose jurisdiction the lands are situated, to have seen the lands cultivated, at least by Amins if no reports came forward to take up them.

2. The Dy Comnr is requested to issue strict orders to the Dy Amildars in the matter of having the lands cultivated from this year forward -

3 The detailed reports called for in the marginally noted communications from Government should be submitted without further delay -

(1) Govt. Endo no 1426-34 dated 14th March 1902 with H 33-96

(2) ⟵ 699 dated 9th October 1902 with H 33-96

(3) Revenue Endo no 1536 dated 20th November 1903

(4) ⟵ no 1681 dated 10th December 1903

Dft

27/1/04

Dy Secretary

Mysore Dept

hs
27/1/04

To

The Dy Comnr Mysore Dt, returning the Vernacular papers — of the Mysore Taluk.

Urgent

No. 275

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,

MYSORE DISTRICT.

~~Enclosures No.~~

MYSORE COVERNMENT 3279.

Dated 2nd March 1905

From H. H. Sparkes Esquire

~~The~~ Deputy Commissioner.
of the Mysore District

To The L. Anantanarayana Rao Esq: B.A.
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Mugrai Department, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your docket No 1081 — dated the 10th December 1903 in the matter of authorizing the defence of the suit at Government cost being conducted against Bette Gowda, one of the tenants of the temple Inam lands of the Sri Kasiviswaraswamy, temple at Ganjam in the Seringapatam Taluk, wherein the Deputy Commissioner is made a party, I have the honor to state that the Subordinate Judge of Mysore has sent a notice to this office intimating that the Civil Suit No 61 of 1892

Execution case No 570 of 03-04

Defendant & judgment debtor
Shanaraj Bhanati since deceased represented by Narasimha Bhanati Goraji

Plaintiffs and decree holders.
Venkatagiri Gosayi

on the file of this Court has been referred to the Hon'ble Chief Court for orders and it has been posted for hearing on the 11th March 1905 and that arrangements may be made to appear before that Court at 11 A.M. on that date either in person or by proxy duly instructed to support the claim of Government.

2. As the Government have already declined to defend the suit at Government cost I solicit the favour of early instructions as to what action should be taken in the matter as all the officials are new to the District and Taluk and are not cognizant of the facts of the case.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

No:

Copy of the Draft

From

The Secretary to Govt

Religious Department

To

The Government

Advocate in Religious

Sir,

I am directed to

forward herewith ~~these~~

~~for your immediate~~

obliging return when no

longer required, the

entire religious file no 33 of 1896

ending with the Religious

Dept Comm's letter no

275 / 3279 dated 2nd March '0

regarding the affairs of

the Sri Kasi Viswanathan

- Swami temple, one of

Received 10/3/05

No. 3345

Dy 10.3.05

Secy File No. 33 of 96

of the Anglo-Vernacular Institutions
at Kanjeeram in the Chingleput
District. From the Govt-
Proc no 1426-34 dated
Aug 23-96
14th March 1902 (marked A
in the file) you will find
that the Institution and
its land endowments were
being managed by one
Dharmaraja Pillai through
his agent Venkatagiri
Naik after the death of the former Naik
Gurusamy, and that there
appears to the temple having
been in the most unsatisfactory
state, the management
of the Institution and its Inam
lands was assumed by
Government in the Anglo
Department in 1897. After
the assumption of the
management by Govt

in 1895
management
continued in
the hands of
the latter;

the Archakar of the
Sreevaragunatoma Swamy
obtained a muttelika
from Venkatarajiri Iyengar
binding him to produce
the produce of the Swamy
lands for 1896-97. Eighteen
muttelikas were similarly
obtained from Batta Gowd
and Hamma Gowda, the
two raigals who were
then cultivating the lands
binding them to pay to
the Archakar on behalf
of the temple, an annual
quitta of 130 Kandies
of horsely, 130 Seers of
other grains and 130
bundles of straw, with
effect from the year
1897-98. The produce of the

the

Inam lands for the years

1897-98, 1898-99 & 1899-900

having, however, been kept-

in the possession of ~~the~~ Bathegowda, one of the

tenants, the creditors

of Venkatagiri Gowdaji,

who had leased the Inam

lands in question to Bathegowda

while the management rested with him

and others, had the produce

attached in satisfaction

of a decree obtained by

them against Venkatagiri

Gowdaji. Venkatagiri

Gowdaji also filed a suit in

the Munsif Sub-Judge's

Court against Bathegowda

for the recovery of certain

produce of the Inam lands

attached to the temple.

Steps are ~~being~~ being

taken by the Dy Commr

on behalf of the temple ✳
to recover the produce
of Venkatagiri Zamindari
from Patta Gramda ~~in~~
in pursuance of
~~the~~ the
~~a~~ muchulika executed
by ~~him~~ them, and the
lessees were evicted
from the possession of
the Inam lands ~~which~~
subsequently
which were leased out-
to one Sivarka Gramda
for the year
for 1900–01.
Before the temple and
Venkatagiri Zamindari
had, it seems, filed
a suit against Dharma-
raja Bahadur (original
suit
no 61 of 1892) who was
the Dharmakartha-Zamindar
of the temple, and obtained
against him
a decree from the
Sub-Judge's Court-
at Nellore for Rs 4349

its endowments came
under the management
of Government

From Venkatagiri Zamindari for 1896-97

From Patta Gramda for 1881-82 ~~to~~ 1884-85 & 1900-01

with interest and costs

on the ground that he

was the defendant's Agent, that he was

managing the temple and
on his behalf
its lands and that in

the course of this agency

he was obliged to pay

moneys from his own

pocket for the maintenance

of the temple. ~~He also obtained~~,

~~it seems, another decree against him~~

~~in the lower Court in O.S.~~

~~suit No of 1892 against~~

~~which he has also appealed~~.

2. From the report
Recent Communication
of Court's ~~letter~~ no 275
3279
dated 2nd March 1905,

which is now under disposal,

it appears that the

Sub-Judge of Mysore

had a notice to him (of Court)

intimating that the
civil suit no 61 of 1892
Exn no 570 of 03-04
noted above ~~supposed to above~~ was
by him
reported to the Chief Court
for orders and that
it has been posted for
hearing tomorrow the
11th instant. As the case
involves the interests of
the Temple, I am directed
to request you to appear
in the Chief Court &
take all needful steps
in the case on behalf
of Government in the
Mysore Department -

3. The Office note
on the subject which
is also sent with the
file explains the circum
for your personal guidance.

Other case name fully

I have the

(Dennis order)

10/3/05

Secretary

Treasury Dept

10/3/05

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department

To

The Deputy Commr
Mysore Dt -

Dated 11th March 1905 -

Despatched

Received

General No. 3366
Muzrai F. No.
36/6.
Enclosure No.

Adverting to his letter
No 275/3279 of 2nd March 1905,
has the honor to state that
the Govt Advocate has been
requested to appear before
the Chief Court of Mysore
on the 11th March 1905
in the matter of the Suit
No 61 of 1892 regarding
the lands endowed to the

Sir Kasi Viswanathan

brief to at Sanjam in the

Koernegata train Paris

By order

11/2/05

Seg. Mus. Depts

As

Confidential

1904-05

From
H. H. Sparkes Esq
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To
L. Pendlebury Esq
Secy to the Govt of H.H
The Maharaja of Mysore
Home Dept Bangalore

Dated 15th March 05

Despatched 3

Received

General No. 303

No.

Enclosure No. one.

Forwards a copy of notice received from the Subordinate Judge Mysore stating that Civil suit No 61 of 1892 is posted for hearing to 18th March 05

18/3/05

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3466.

Submitted for information.
The file was sent to the Govt Secretariat on the 10th March 1905
Jr
22/3/05

File.
Place this in the connected file
KR
23/3/05
Jr

Mus: 33-15

Deputy Commissioner's office
Mysore District
Dated Mysore 15th March 1905

To A. Anantasammi Rao Esq: B.A
Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharajah
of Mysore, Mugrai Department
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your docket- No
3366 dated the 11th March 1905 stating
that the Government Advocate has
been requested to appear before the
Chief Court of Mysore on the 11th
March 1905 to defend the Civil Suit
No 61 of 1892 regarding the lands
endowed to the Sri Kasi Visweswara
Swamy temple at Ganjam in the
Seringapatam Taluk, I have the honor
to forward herewith copy of another
notice received with letter No 271 of
the 11/13th March 1905 from the Subor-
dinate Judge, Mysore, intimating
that the case has been posted for
hearing to 18th March 1905.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Chandrasekhara

For Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

No 5

Duplicate.

In the Court of the Subordinate Judge
at Mysore

Civil Suit No 61 of 1892
Execution case No 570 of 1903 on

Plaintiff's decree holder Venkatagiriyaya
Defendants Judgt debtor Chamarajakhan
since deceased represented by
Narasimha Khanda Gavayi

To.

H H Sharbes Esquire
Assistt Commissioner
Mysore

Sir, Whereas the above specified
case in which the properties of the
lands belonging to Kasiviswesvara
Swamy at Gungam which was
attached has been referred to The
Hon'ble the Chief Court for orders
and it has been registered as referred
case No 4 of 1904 05 by that Court
and posted for hearing to 15th
March 1905. I have the honor to
give you notice as per the Orde

of the Hon'ble the Chief Court dated
10th March 1905 to appear at 11 A.M.
before that Court on that date
either in person or by proxy duly
instructed to support the claim
of Government.

Given under my hand and the
seal of the Court this the 11th day of March 1905

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient servant

D Ramanuja
Subordinate Judge

He

Office of the Govt. Advocate
in Mysore

No. 150
Enclosure No. 1 & 1 file.

Bangalore. 10th May 05

Rupees
2
13/5/05

From.

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To. The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
Municipal Dept

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4215

Sir.

With reference to your
No. 3345
dated 10th April 05, I have
the honor to forward for your information
copy of the order passed in the
Referred suit by the Hon'ble Mr. Justice
of the Court.

The delay in obtaining the
to the various documents was
the original.

The file received with your
above is herewith returned.

I have the
Your obedient

In the Chief Court of Mysore
at Bangalore

Present.

Mr. Justice A. E. Stacy, Chief Judge
Mr. Justice A. Rama Rao
and
Mr. Justice H. V. Nanjundayya, Judge.

Civil Referred case No. 4 of 04-05, referred by the Subordinate Judge of Kolar in Execution case No. 570 of 03-04.

Venkatarajiah Gowda ... Plaintiff

vs.

Narasimha Bharathi Gowda ... Defendant

This case coming on for hearing on Saturday the 18th day of March 1905 and upon perusing the records and hearing the arguments of the Court pronounced the following

The Chief Judge:- This is a reference under Section 617 Civil Procedure Code by the Subordinate Judge of Kolar. He has asked this Court to decide what procedure should be adopted by him in dealing with the present

stated by him. There are substantially
as follows In execution of an ex parte
decree in O S No. 61 of 1892 obtained by
her ex-majesty Jayaji organized Thanavaya
Pillai in his capacity of the Karai Vinayakar
temple, and its endowments, the Jayaji
attached its Sarva Inam lands and
applied for their sale, in execution
case No. 1[illegible] of 1896 7. The Munsiff
Secretary allowed the application, on
the ground that the ex-majesty had
been removed that the endowment
was under Government management
and that no civil court should entertain
the application for execution. It was rejected in this
[illegible] by the petitioner and
the case [illegible] was referred to the
[illegible] for relief. A decree holder
[illegible] filed applications
[illegible] subordinate judge courts for

execution of this and another decree which he had requested the Court to manage and to cause crops and income of the Temple to be attached and sold. The lands were sold on the 10th September 1901 in execution case no 607 of 1900-01 subject to the claims of Government and purchased by the Gosavi Ishwar took out proceedings attempting to get actual possession of the land and crops in miscellaneous case No. 529 of 1901-02 the Deputy Commissioner applied to the District Judge for release of the crops attached by the subordinate judge. the application was granted with costs by the District Judge by an order dated 29th September 1902 (exhibit 4) on the ground that the Gosavi's decree being on a mortgage decree, the [illegible] (on the [illegible] claim has not a [illegible]

[illegible] Gosavi [illegible]

[illegible] Meanwhile

Stated by him there are substantially
as follows In execution of an ex parte
decree in O S No. 61 of 1892 obtained by
the late agin Gosayi organised Thanadipa
Mutt in respect of the Kasi Viswesvara
temple, and its endowments, the Gosayi
attached its Sarvo Inam lands and
applied for their Sale, in execution
case, No. 1 of 1896 The Munsiff
Secondary approved the application, on
the ground that the encumbrances had
been removed that the endowment
was under Government management
and that no civil court had jurisdiction
thereafter the application for
execution was rejected on the 14th December
1897 by the said learned Judge and
the case below was referred to the
Board in lieu of the decree holder
Civil Revision Petition + Civil Applications
in Original Judge Courts for

execution of this and another decree
which he had against the former
manager and to cause crops and mango
lands of the temple to be attached and
sold. The lands were sold on the 30th
september 1901 in execution case no 607
of 1900-01 subject to the claims of
government and purchased by the
Gosayi Ishwar took out proceedings
attempting to get actual possession of
the land and crops on his settlement
case No. 529 of 1901-02 the defendant
petitioner applied to the District
Judge for release of the crops attached
by the subordinate judge. The application
was rejected with costs by the
District Judge by an order dated 29
September 1902 (exhibit 4) on the ground
that the Gosayi decree being a
mortgage decree, the [illegible]
[illegible] had not
[illegible] special [illegible]
[illegible] Code, [illegible] meanwhile

crop had been sold on behalf of Government
and the money realized deposited in the
Savings Bank to credit of the temple. The
Gosaye applied for an order to have the
sale proceed deposited in court and
paid to him, but though the deputy com-
missioner's objections have been rejected
by the subordinate judge and the district
court, the money has not been paid into
court. The learned subordinate judge has
ordered that when it has
been brought to notice of the executing court
that Government had abandoned the lands
and has no interest in them, the court should
not have proceeded against the lands
their produce, subsequent to the order
of the subordinate judge, dated
4th November 1897 and has set aside
that and the proceedings of the subordinate
court, and district judge's courts declaring
the land liable to sale to satisfy
the meaningless and
ultra vires arrangement Government has
to that this difficulty is (1) that he has no

to enforce the order of the district judge (exhibit 9) and (2) that the said Deputy Commissioner persistently neglects to comply with the requisition of the subordinate judge's court.

I do not consider it necessary to decide in these proceedings whether the order of the learned district judge referred to was correct or not. It is merely an order, rejecting the Deputy Commissioner's application on the ground of a ruling Seefholt v. Peters 3 L R I C P 631 That proceedings by way of claim under section 278 Civil Procedure Code, are applicable only to money decrees. There was no execution or decision as to the claims of Deputy Commissioner's award decree holders respectively and no order restoring the decree holders to possession against the friends in the hands of the Deputy Commissioner pursuant to the ruling quoted above. The

with the Deputy Commissioner either to file
a suit to establish his right or to
regret the final decree holder there
is no order of the learned judge which the
learned subordinate judge is required to
enforce. If the Deputy Commissioner
persistently neglect to comply with the
order of the subordinate judge in exe-
cution, the decree holder has his remedy
the decree holder may obtain his
remedy against resistance to execution
[illegible] he advised and on the
part he has no opinion to express
the reference of the learned subor-
dinate Judge to this Court under Section
617, Civil Procedure Code, appears to have
been made, of his own motion, and under,
a misapprehension as to the circum-
stances. We think that he should
be no order as to costs of the
reference.

Let this letter be returned, as
required, & a stamp
[illegible]

Chief Judge

Dy Registrar
Dy Registrar

I agree

27/3/05 (Sd) H. V Nanjundayya
Judge

3/4/05 (Signed)
H Rangasamayya
Judge

EARLY.

(Apt as per dewan's order)

190

From D.C. Ld.

To The Dy Commr
Mysore Dt

Dated 22nd August 1903

Despatched

Received

General No. 969
No.

Enclosure No. Nil

Adverting to his letter
No 303 of 15th March 1905
& in continuation of this
Office docket No 3366/
1902-7 33-96
of the 11th idem regarding
the suit relating to the
lands endowed to the Sri
Kasi Viswesvara Swami
temple at Gundlupet, Chamarajnagar
Taluk, has the honor to
forward herewith for information
a copy of the judgment

of the Chief Court of Mysore
on the subject, and to
request that a report may be submitted
as to what further action
the Dy Commr proposes being
taken in the matter.

By order,

(Dewan's orders) 21/8/05
Secy
Revs. Depts

Dy 9.8.05 ks
20/8/05

(Dft as per Dewan's orders).

190 2 51

From

To The Govt. Advocate in Mysore

Dated 22nd August 1905.

Despatched

Received

General No. 968

No.

Enclosure No.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. 160 D/ 10th May 1905 forwarding copy of Judgment of the Chief Court of Mysore in ~~Dated~~ Civil referred Case No 4 of 1904--05, relating to the inam lands attached to the Sri Kasi Viswesvaraswamy temple at Ganjam in the Srirangapatam Taluk, I am directed to request

Read 24-8-05

25/10

From Govt Advocate no 52 D 14/9/1905

the favour of your advising
Govt as to what should
now be done in the interests
of the Temple

I have re
Dewan's order
20/8/05
Secretary
Mun: Dept

19.8.05
20/8/05

Office of the Government Advocate
in Mysore
Bangalore 14th September 1905

No. 52

MYSORE CO
1276
15-9-05

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To

subd with draft
19.9.05

The Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharajah of
Mysore
Municipal Department.

Sir,

With reference to your Letter
No. 968, dated the 22nd Ultimo I have
the honor to request that you will be
good enough to forward for reference
Municipal file No. 33 of 1896 returned
to you with this Office No. 150, dated
10th May 1905 and to inform me as
whether as a matter of fact the Inam
Lands attached to the Sree Kasiviswa
Swamy temple at Ganjam in the
Shrirangapatana Taluq is at
present-

present in the possession or Manage
ment of the Muzrie Department;
or whether the same has been taken
possession of by Venkatagiri Gosaye
as purchaser at the Court Sale.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most obedient Servant.
N. Narayana Rao
Government Advocate

Mysore

No 1580 D/22.9.06

To,

The Govt. Advocate
in Mysore

Sir,

As desired in your
letter no 52 dt 4th Sept. 06,
am directed
I beg to forward herewith
for your reference & return
Mysore file no 33 of 1896,
and to state that the inam
land attached the Sri Kasi
Viswesvara swami temple
at Ganjam in the Srirangapatam
taluk is now under the
management of the taluk
Amildar who is the local

Muzrai Officer. The proceeds

from the inam land

are being collected and

deposited in the Govt. Savings

Bank in the name of the

Amildar. ~~The amount~~

~~at the credit of the mutt~~

~~at the end of Sept 1904~~

~~was Rs 24934-0~~.

2. I am to request the favour of your returning the Muzrai file at an early date with your opinion — I have &c

21/9/05

Leg. Muz: Dept

20/9/05

No 68
Ex No 1 file

Office of the Government Agent
in Mysore
Bangalore 26th September 1905

Rupees
Rs
27/9/05

From
14-92
27-9-05
SECRETARIAT

The Government Agent
in Mysore

To

Draft & Dy Comm
Subd Rappl
W
30/9/05

The Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharajah
of Mysore
Muzrai Dept

Sir,

Your letter Nos 968-1580,
dated 22nd August & 22nd Instant
respectively.

I learn from the 2nd letter quoted above from the file forwarded that the Inam land attached to the Sree Kasi Vishweswara Temple at Gangam is at present in the possession and management of the Muzrai Department. If so, I am of opinion that no further steps need now be taken. The

Thus

that the Deputy Commissioner may be instructed to inform the Subordinate Judge in reply to his requisition for sending over the value of the produce now held in deposit to the credit of the temple, that the same cannot be complied with inasmuch as the crops did not belong to the Judgment debtor. This will drive the Court Sale Purchaser to a suit for the recovery of the land with its produce which said may, I think, be successfully defended on various grounds such as (1) the resumption of the management of the temple affairs by Government, (2) the collusive nature of the decree obtained without making the Mirasi Department which was in possession of the land a party to the suit and (3) the invalidity of the sale held by

by the Civil Court &c.

The decision of the honorable Chief Court in Civil Referred Case No 4 of 1904-05 also confirms the adoption of the Course Samples for the above

The Money file A 233 is herewith Returned -

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient
S. Nivayanadoo
Government Advocate

From

To The Dy Commr
Mysore District

Dated ~~20th Sept~~ 1905

Despatched 21.11.05

Received

General No. 2400
No.

Enclosure No. /

In continuation of this Office docket no 969 dy 22nd Augt 1905 regarding the suit relating the lands endowed to the Sri Kasi Viswesvaraswami Temple at Sanjam, Seringapatam Taluk, has the honor to forward herewith Copy of letter no 68 dy 26th Sept. 1905 from the Govt Advocate in Mysore, suggesting the further procedure to be

16.XI.05

Rec'd 18/11/05

18/11/05

adopted
~~taken~~ in the matter, and
to request that needful
action may be taken
& a report submitted in
due course for the information
of Govt.

By order
9/10/05
Legl Mem Deptt.

2/
30/9/05
30/9/05
Copy is forwarded to the
Govt Advocate for info
with ref to his No 68 of 26th Sept 05

By order
9/
Legl Mem Deptt.

2/

Muz. 5]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

190

From

The Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner Mysore District.

Dated

Despatched 5-4-06.

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 4473
M. No.

This Office No. 2408 dated 21st November 1905 forwarding Copy of Govt. Advocate's letter No. 688 of 26th Sept 1905 suggesting the further procedure to be adopted in re the suit relating and ~~subsequent~~ reminder marginally noted to the lands endowed to the Sri Kasi Visweswara Swami temple at Ganjam Seringapatam Taluk.

Has the honor to draw attention to the above and to request ~~to be informed as to what action has been taken in the matter and when a reply may be expected.~~ to be informed of the action taken in the matter

By Order,

Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

27/3/06

Deferred Telegram.

To,

Mysore, Deputy Commissioner

Please send immediately entire records of Ganjam Gosayis Visweswara temple with your opinion on Venkatagiri Gosayis claim. Parties here pressing speedy Settlement.

Dated. L.A.

27. 4. 1908.

"Copy

WC



ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ

ಸಿಟಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸೆಷನ್ಸ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

CE 1908-09ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೂಲ ಅರ್ಜಿ ನಂಬರು

ಅಫಿಡವಿಟ್ ಪಾದಿ ಗೌಡ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನಾದಿ

1 ವೆಂಕಟಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿ ತಂದೆ ವೆಂಕಟಾಚಲ

2 ನಾರಾಯಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮುದಲಿಯಾರ್

Presented by
J. Narayanaswamy Advocate
ಫಿರ್ಯಾದಿ ಅಫಿಡವಿಟ್ ಅಂತೆ ಸಹಿಯವರ ರವಾನಿಗೆ

ಕಲಂ 2 ಅಫಿಡವಿಟ್ ಆದದ್ದು

ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ಸಕಾಲತ್ತನಾಮೆ

ಈ ಪೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗ್ಗೆರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಸ್ವಸಂ ಜೊಂದಕಕ್ಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ನನಿಗೆ ಸ್ವತಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಲ್ಕು ಪೂಬಲಿಗು ಡಿಸ್ಮಿನೊಬಲಿಗು ದಸ್ಕಾನಜು ವಗ್ಗೆರೆ ರಗಮುಕೊಂಡು ರಸೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹಾ ತಮಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನುಡಿಸುವ ಯುಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪುವು ಇದರಿಂದ ಬದ್ದನಾಗಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು ಪೈ 17-11 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ } ರುಜು.

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯದವರು ಸೆನ್ನೆ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರಿಯೆಸ್ಟೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. J Narayanaswamy Advocate

ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

J Narayanaswamy
Advocate

ಈ ಫಾರಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಶಿವ ಬಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ ನಂ1 ಲಾಯರ್ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಾಬಿಪ್ಪಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊತ್ತಿದೆ

J. L. N. Press, – Bangalore City.

Pub-up
with Kasi Viswesware
temple file - Sagar Shah
Venkatapur Sagar claim
+ Gune

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4489
7/5/08

3 కలిసి చూడండి సంబంధిత వరుస క్రమాంకాలు 1903-4 లోపు ఉన్నవి 571 సంఖ్యలతో

రాజు భూమి 2137-2-7 కి సంబంధించిన వివరణలో వరుస క్రమాంకాలు 1037-2-7

ఉన్న భూమి 2137-2-7 కి సంబంధించిన వరుస క్రమాంకాలు 1903-4 లోపు ఉన్నవి 571

వరుస క్రమాంకాలు మాత్రం 1100 కంటే ఎక్కువ ఉన్నవి కాబట్టి 2137-2-7

భూమి — 1100 — ను చేర్చి 2137-2-7 భూమి యొక్క అనుభవదారుల జాబితాలో

వీరి పేర్లు చేర్చడానికి అభ్యంతరం లేదని తెలిపారు కాబట్టి 2137-2-7

భూమి యొక్క అనుభవదారుల జాబితాలో వీరి పేర్లు చేర్చడమైనది

2137-2-7 భూమి యొక్క అనుభవదారుల జాబితాలో వీరి పేర్లు

చేర్చడానికి అభ్యంతరం లేదని తెలిపారు కాబట్టి 2137-2-7 భూమి

యొక్క అనుభవదారుల జాబితాలో వీరి పేర్లు చేర్చడమైనది

1100 కంటే ఎక్కువ వరుస క్రమాంకాలు కాబట్టి 1037-2-7 భూమి

యొక్క అనుభవదారుల జాబితాలో వీరి పేర్లు చేర్చడమైనది

తేదీ 15 లోపు తిరిగి సమర్పించాలి

ఈ కార్యాలయం నుండి ఇచ్చిన వరుస క్రమాంకాలు 1100 కంటే ఎక్కువ

ఉన్నవి కాబట్టి 1037-2-7 భూమి యొక్క అనుభవదారుల జాబితాలో

వీరి పేర్లు చేర్చడానికి అభ్యంతరం లేదని తెలిపారు కాబట్టి

2137-2-7 భూమి యొక్క అనుభవదారుల జాబితాలో వీరి పేర్లు

చేర్చడమైనది

ఈ కార్యాలయం నుండి ఇచ్చిన వరుస క్రమాంకాలు 1100 కంటే

ఎక్కువ ఉన్నవి కాబట్టి 1037-2-7 భూమి యొక్క అనుభవదారుల

జాబితాలో వీరి పేర్లు చేర్చడమైనది

తేదీ 15 లోపు తిరిగి సమర్పించాలి

7-7-1911

Kuthuma Gutar Mandal Revenue Officer